DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 271 UD 024 547

AUTHOR Jaffe, Natalie
TITLE Summer Employment Programs for Disadvantaged Youth: Issues and Options.
INSTITUTION Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
PUB DATE 3 Jul 85
NOTE 27p.; A paper prepared for the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.
AVAILABLE FROM Public/Private Ventures, 399 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106 ($2.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Programs; *Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Employment Experience; *Federal Programs; *Summer Programs; *Youth Employment; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Summer Youth Employment Program

ABSTRACT

Summer job programs for youth, including Federal programs and private-public partnerships, have come, over the years, to emphasize either short-term or long-term goals. Short-term goals include providing summer activity to the largest possible number of teens, providing income to economically disadvantaged youth, and providing structured work experiences for youth just entering the labor market. Long-term goals include improving the long-term employability of economically and/or educationally disadvantaged youth and producing improved community facilities or services. This paper summarizes the history of summer employment programs for youth, defines some of the problems with meeting the goals of these programs both administratively and financially, and discusses how youth job programs operate and what improvements could be made. The conclusions include: (1) While short-term objectives are met, work experience in a currently operated summer job program has little if any impact on a youth's long-term employability; and (2) The brevity of summer jobs makes it difficult to administer the programs and tends to undermine attempts at developing continuing contacts. Recommendations for program improvement include: setting clear goals which fit the specific community context; introducing enriched summer program components for the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (SYEP) more effectively; identifying private sector resources among businesses and foundations and creating coordinating mechanisms for matching these organizations with those who need them; and focussing on management and quality of programs. (CG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED263271

P/PV

Public/Private Ventures

399 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106
(215) 592-9099

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH: ISSUES AND OPTIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Paper Prepared for the
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

July 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Natalie Jaffe
Public/Private Ventures
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD024547

Public/Private Ventures
Board of Directors

Rex D. Adams
General Manager
Employee Relations
Mobil Oil Corporation
New York, New York

Judith Barker
President
The Borden Foundation
Columbus, Ohio

Alan Campbell
Vice Chairman
ARA Services, Inc.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Edwin D. Campbell
Executive Vice President
National Alliance of Business
Washington, D.C.

Walter D'Alessio
President & Chief Executive Officer
Latimer and Buck
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Nolen Ellison
President
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio

Sol Hurwitz
Senior Vice President
Committee for Economic Development
New York, New York

Katharine C. Lyall
Vice President, Academic Affairs
University of Wisconsin System
Madison, Wisconsin

Arabella Martinez
Arabella Martinez Institute
Washington, D.C.

Steven A. Minter
Director
The Cleveland Foundation
Cleveland, Ohio

Ersa H. Poston
Personnel Management Consultant
McLean, Virginia

William J. Spring
Consultant to the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
Boston, Massachusetts

Anita A. Summers
Chairperson, Department of Public Policy and Management
The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Alfred M. Zuck
Executive Director
National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration
Washington, D.C.

Alan Campbell
Chairman of the Board

Michael A. Bailin
President

Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) is a national, not-for-profit corporation that seeks effective approaches to job training and education for disadvantaged citizens. P/PV designs and manages demonstration projects, conducts program evaluations, and provides technical assistance to others. Its work is supported by funds from both the public and private sectors.

A list of publications and further information about P/PV are available from: The Resource Center, Public/Private Ventures, 399 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19106. Telephone: 215-592-9099.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH
ISSUES AND OPTIONS

A Paper Prepared for the
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

July 3, 1985

Principal Author: Natalie Jaffe

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SOME HISTORY	3
	Federally-funded Programs	3
	Private-sector Programs	5
	Summer Youth Conservation and Service Corps	6
III.	RESEARCH FINDINGS	6
IV.	A REVIEW OF CURRENT PRACTICE	7
	Goals and Characteristics	8
	Keeping Youth Off the Street	8
	Providing Income	11
	Providing Structured Work Experience	11
	Improving Longer-term Employability	12
	Producing Improved Community Facilities or Services	13
V.	ISSUES AND OPTIONS FOR ALL PROGRAMS	14
	Placing Summer Programs in Context	14
	Funding	15
	Subsidized/Unsubsidized Jobs	16
	Setting Priorities Among the Needs of Youth/Business/Community	17
	Administration	17
	Targeting	18
	Youth Selection Processes	19
VI.	SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1984 -- a typical year -- about 2.5 million teenagers entered the labor force seeking summer jobs. Close to 60 percent of them found employment through their own efforts and contacts. In order to help as many as possible of those who are not so lucky -- those who lack the know-how or connections to find a summer job -- most communities sponsor organized, usually subsidized, community-wide summer employment programs.

Among publicly-funded employment and training programs, summer jobs programs for youth are the most visible and enjoy the most popular support. Along with the benefits that such popular approval brings, summer jobs programs face community pressures -- to serve as many youth as possible, from as many neighborhoods and ethnic groups as possible, as visibly as possible.

Since the inauguration of the War on Poverty in 1964, federal funds have been available for these programs year after year. In the summer of 1984, some 700,000 young people were employed under the aegis of the federal Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (SYEP), which mandated service to youth who are between the ages of 14 and 21 and are poor. Funded at $800 million in 1985, SYEP is responsible for as much as 80 percent of the increase in employment that occurs each summer among minority youth, researchers estimate.

Partly to expand resources for supplying summer jobs and partly to meet youth needs in addition to those for income, federal dollars are often supplemented locally with public, private-sector and/or foundation funds, in-kind contributions and projects that operate either in tandem with the SYEP or as separate efforts.

During the 20 years of summer jobs programing, the goals of federally-funded programs have altered somewhat, as the nation's priorities and expectations have changed. Legislative mandates have changed in response, and levels of funding have fluctuated wildly. Increasingly, communities view summer opportunities creatively and have, over the years, made many attempts, large and small, to enrich local programs -- with job offerings that have implications for a youth's future, with closer connections to the private sector, with upgraded job quality, with improved supervision, and so on.

But the almost crippling constraints on summer programing for the most part prevent communities from planning their programs systematically, as part of a continuum of services to youth in need. These constraints include the following:

- Because of the high visibility of summer youth jobs programs, they are vulnerable to political pressures. Primary effort is invested in ensuring that every interest group receives its fair share, and is <u>seen</u>

to receive its fair share. Major changes can be made or new agendas pursued only if the community perceives the need for such change.

- Because of the characteristic lateness of Congressional decision-making on funding and wide fluctuations in funding levels -- anticipated even if not actual -- communities do not know from year to year, often from week to week, what size program they will be able to run. It is often necessary to plan for as many as three different levels of summer funding in the spring. (An example: in 1983, the city of Chicago received $24 million for summer youth jobs. The following spring, it was notified it would receive only half that amount for 1984. After scaling down the program and enduring harsh community criticism, the program received an additional $10.2 million just two weeks before the program was to start. The program's operator wondered to an interviewer how it could be expected to get good jobs when it only had two weeks to recruit, enroll and place thousands of youth. "We're lucky to get any jobs at this point," he said.)

- Under even the best circumstances, program operators must enroll a very large number of youth, provide jobs and supervision, and establish careful payroll and accounting procedures -- all for a six- to eight-week program; and this, under funding arrangements that allow for very few, if any, year-round staff.

- JTPA Title IIB funding allows only 15 percent for administrative costs; very large programs can draw on this pool to administer projects that receive other funding, but small programs find it difficult to run private-sector funded components without incurring additional administrative costs.

With the reduction in federal funding for youth employment programing today, it is even more urgent to use available funds wisely, in pursuit of carefully defined goals. Given the additional constraints, much more creative use of private-sector and foundation resources will be required. And given the experience amassed over the past two decades, information is certainly available on which to base decisions in pursuit of such goals.

This paper is an attempt to review the development of summer youth jobs programing above with some relevant research, to define the issues and options available to planners and operators of summer projects, to place these summer opportunities in a context -- as just one group of strategies in a continuum of interventions designed to reduce the risk of long-term unemploy-

ment among youth who are poor -- and to offer some recommendations.

The information in this paper is based on a review of the literature; on P/PV's own experience examining and evaluating a range of summer youth employment programs in Philadelphia, New York City, and Flint, Michigan and some youth conservation and service corps efforts; on a telephone survey of the summer programs operated in 1984 in 40 local service delivery areas (SDAs) around the country; and on developmental activities undertaken in connection with designing and mounting a national demonstration of an enriched summer youth jobs program, the Summer Training and Education Program (STEP).

II. SOME HISTORY

Federally-funded programs

The first major government-sponsored youth employment programs in the U.S. were the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and National Youth Administration (NYA) projects initiated during the Great Depression. These programs served large numbers of youth. In combination, the CCC, NYA and Works Progress Administration (WPA) served as many youth in 1940 as did the Carter Administration's Youth Employment Programs in their heyday in 1979.

The primary purpose of the CCC and NYA programs was to put money in the hands of an impoverished population. However, the programs were also geared to producing useful work.

The accomplishments of the CCC are well known, and many are still standing. The work of the NYA is less recognized. Its work included building athletic fields, playgrounds and recreation centers; planting shrubbery and trees; and painting and maintenance. The NYA also conducted a number of "production in use" projects for the poor, including repairing furniture, sewing new clothes, and processing and canning food.

The first major government-sponsored summer youth employment effort was the summer component of the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC), legislated as part of the War on Poverty program in 1964. The NYC also included year-round out-of-school and in-school components. At least in theory, the goals of the NYC were very similar to those of the CCC and NYA programs. In Senate debate, Hubert Humphrey noted that the goals of the program were "to put idle youth to work constructively and, in some cases, to help prevent high school dropouts by providing part-time work." In practice, the demands of employing large numbers of youth and the constraints of federal funding at first overwhelmed the desire to produce useful work. In effect, the goals of the NYC became totally centered on providing income or keeping the streets quiet during the turbulent 1960s summers.

With the enactment of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973, summer youth jobs programs were required to provide, also, orientation to the world of work, labor market information and careful monitoring of projects. As a result, substantial improvements were made in the quality of jobs and levels of supervision. Under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) of 1982, expenditures for activities enhancing employability and developing skills are allowed, but are not required.

As the federally-funded summer youth employment effort has progressed through the Nixon, Ford, Carter and Reagan Administrations, through CETA and JTPA, and through many changes of name -- now the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program, still commonly referred to as SYEP -- three goals have continued to characterize the program. Over the years, emphasis has shifted among these goals, which can be summarized as follows:

1. to provide summer employment for youth;

2. to reduce teenage crime; and

3. to redistribute income to the poor.

It was hoped that, ultimately, summer jobs programs would increase the lifetime earnings of enrollees through training, work experience and incentives to stay in school and work.

The first national effort to fulfill this hope began in 1971, when a private sector vocational education component was added to summer youth programs. In 1976, this component was formally designated the Vocational Exploration Program (VEP). VEP was intended to help disadvantaged youth explore a variety of career options during the summer and learn about the mental, physical and educational requirements of these careers. It was hoped that such career exploration would translate to increased incentives to remain in school and to expanded career and life expectations. The federal component of VEP was jointly administered by the National Alliance of Business and the AFL-CIO.

A second national effort that used the summer employment program in a strategy aimed at long-term results was the Carter Administration's Youth Incentive Entitlement Projects program. Although Entitlement was much more than a summer youth program, summer employment was a key aspect of program strategy. The program linked the promise of a full-time summer job and part-time year-round employment with the condition that participants not drop out of school. The demonstration program was managed and researched by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation of New York.

In the 1980s, growing perception of the seriousness of persisting youth unemployment and of the potential for summer programing in a time of scarce resources have inspired new efforts to enrich the federally-funded summer jobs programs. These have included

attempts to upgrade the level of supervision, matching the interests of enrollees with their job placements, remediation, mentoring, counseling and occupational information, vocational exploration, increased exposure to job opportunities in the private sector -- all possible to fund under JTPA.

Private-Sector Programs

Private-sector involvement in summer youth jobs programing began in the 1960s, as business pursued its clear self-interest in helping to keep youth occupied during the "long, hot summers." Its original role was to add the possibility of private-sector placements to the roster of summer jobs available to economically disadvantaged youth. The National Association of Business (NAB) took the lead in encouraging this involvement. Over the years, private-sector employers have come more and more to work with the Job Service and JTPA programs to provide placements that could spark career interest in their own companies among the participants. Other forms of private-sector participation include funding for non-profits to hire youth in summer jobs that serve the needs of the organization's clientele.

To date, most corporations confine their involvement to the funding or provision of specific jobs -- as in the New York City Partnership program, Baltimore's Blue Chip-In and Philadelphia's Phil-A-Job, for example -- rather than supporting attempts to broaden summer youth programing beyond basic employment. Foundations, too, are involved in simple expansion of summer youth jobs. The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, for example, has provided funds to the school district in Flint, Michigan, to employ 600 additional youth in summer employment programs. A consortium of foundations in Philadelphia funds the provision of summer jobs by community and non-profit agencies.
Recent organized attempts to establish clear goals and provide substantially enriched summer programs have been fostered by foundations and corporations, which have either operated separate summer youth jobs programs or have supplemented those of the SYEP.

The Summer Training and Education (STEP) demonstration that P/PV is currently conducting for the Ford Foundation is an example of a model that supplements the SYEP. In this demonstration, an intensive remedial education component is added to the basic SYEP model. The demonstration also includes career and life planning aspects and a component aimed at reducing teenage pregnancy. JTPA funds cover youth stipends in addition to such other costs as remediation teacher salaries, transportation between remediation and work sites, and staff time for curriculum development. In-kind support is also extended, typically by the public schools. Funds from Ford and other foundations support planning, model testing and research.

Examples of independent programs include such projects as Career Explorations, conducted by Hunter College of the City University of New York with support from the Commonwealth Fund. In this program, enrollees spend six weeks in special internship positions in fields relating to health, science or technology, as an incentive to remain in school and pursue additional education in these fields, and to develop relationships with adult mentors in allied fields.

Corporate support for separate enriched programing is typified by the Mobil Oil Corporation program in New York City. The corporation sponsors the employment of 500 youth in "clean teams" in the city's subways. They work in small crews with transit authority employees as supervisors. One hundred of these youth also spend one day a week at the Mobil Academy receiving help with reading and math.

Summer Youth Conservation and Service Corps

Following a different evolutionary path from the federally-funded youth employment programs -- which target the disadvantaged and emphasize the provision of jobs and income -- are the summer youth conservation and service corps programs that have been initiated since 1970. These programs are lineal descendants of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration projects of the 1930s; their emphasis is on production and physical benefits to the community and they enroll a cross-section of the youth population.

The Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) is the prime example of the conservation corps concept applied to summer programing. Begun in 1971, the YCC reached its peak in 1978 when it enrolled 47,000 youth. YCC included both federal and state components and operated both residential and non-residential sites. Since 1980, the program has been cut severely by the federal government. Currently, YCC enrolls about 5,000 youth each summer.

With reduced federal spending for YCC -- and the elimination of its sister program, the year-round Young Adult Conservation Corps -- state and local governments have begun developing their own summer conservation corps programs. Eleven of the 16 existing summer conservation corps projects supported by states or localities are extensions of year-round programs; the other five stand alone. The summer corps efforts usually use JTPA summer youth funding in proportion to the number of their participants who are JTPA-eligible. In the summer of 1985, these programs will enroll about 20,000 youth, three-quarters of them in Michigan alone.

III. RESEARCH FINDINGS

The results of research on summer youth employment programs have been mixed. Some research studies have tested the effects that summer youth programing alone have on the subsequent school and

earnings experiences of participants. By and large, these studies did not produce evidence that summer work experience alone has positive, statistically significant impact on subsequent employability.

Of four studies that examined the effects of summer jobs programs on juvenile delinquency, two claimed positive impact and two no impact. In general, there does not appear to be conclusive evidence to say whether or not summer employment efforts reduce juvenile crime.

More promising have been the results of programs that either tie summer employment to year-round programing or enrich the summer employment experience in some other way.

- Research findings from the Entitlement demonstration indicated post-program earnings gains for participants, even though desired effects on high school graduation rates did not occur.

- Research on the VEP enrichment of summer youth programs suggested gains among participants in work-related attitudes, social attitudes and self esteem.

- Findings from the Youth Conservation Corps, a summer conservation corps effort, suggest similar attitudinal gains among participants.

- Research conducted by P/PV on the pilot phase of the enriched Summer Training and Education Program (STEP) found statistically significant gains in reading and math.

In summary, research on summer youth employment alone has not been able, for the most part, to document long-term effects on earnings, high school graduation or juvenile crime. Results from enriched summer programs or programs that link summer jobs to year-round employment and education are, however, more promising.

IV. A REVIEW OF CURRENT PRACTICE

Despite funding constraints, political pressures and administrative difficulties that face summer youth programing, some local program planners and operators have managed slowly but steadily to improve the quality of their programs for all enrollees and to develop enriched components that have the potential to achieve some longer-term goals. For the most part, enrichments are provided in small segments of the overall program. But they do give evidence that efforts are being made to capitalize on the possibilities offered by continued federal funding of summer youth programing. These programs, at the least, are making efforts to provide the kind of supervision that engenders the development of good work habits.

The richness and sophistication of a summer jobs program is in direct proportion to the experience of its administrators. Unfortunately, the change in administrative entities required by the change from CETA to JTPA has somewhat retarded the continued refinement of summer youth job offerings, as staffs of the new administrative entities gain experience in running these complex and challenging programs.

Based on observations P/PV has made during evaluations of individual programs and surveys of existing practice around the country, it is possible to identify some of the aims that today's summer jobs programs seem to reflect, and to point out how each objective dictates some key characteristics.

Goals and Characteristics

Consciously or not, summer jobs programs -- or components of programs -- aim either for long-term or short-term goals. There appear to be three possible short-term goals: providing some activity to the largest possible number of teenagers during the summer; providing income -- either maximum income to the neediest youth or minimum income to the largest possible number; and providing work experience, usually on an introductory level.

Programs with longer-term goals fall into two categories: those whose primary aim is to improve the employability of youth, and those that seek to provide the community with lasting physical or social benefits. Both goals may be met, but one should take precedence during the development of program plans.

The discussion that follows assumes the identification of one of the five goals as primary, though realization of subsidiary goals will inevitably result in part from most programs. The discussion also assumes that a community's overall summer youth jobs program can include a variety of components or tiers. The largest component commonly will pursue one of the short-term goals; smaller components, targeting certain segments of the youth population, may be created to meet longer-term objectives.

The choice of primary goal has, of course, implications for a program's key characteristics: the number, age and type of youth served; the number of hours worked; the nature of jobs and employers; and costs in addition to basic administration and youth wages. (See chart). The following discussion will examine each of these characteristics in light of the primary goal sought.

Goal I: "Keeping Youth Off the Street"

Despite the rhetoric about summer youth programing's four goals, the programs of the 1960s had one principal aim -- riot prevention. This aim was clear to program planners and operators, and was perceived with approval by the public.

SUBSIDIZED SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS
PRIMARY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES: ISSUES AND OPTIONS

ISSUES	Short Term Goals			Long Term Goals	
	"Keep Youth Off the Street"	Provide Income	Provide Work Experience	Improve Longer-Term Employability	Produce Community Benefits
Number of Youth	As many as possible	Varies depending on targeting decision	Varies depending on quality of work experience	Limited	Limited
Age of youth served	14-19 year olds. More likely to be effective for younger youth	14-21 year olds	16-19 year olds	Will vary with program emphasis	16-21 year olds
Other eligibility criteria	Typically economically disadvantaged	Economically disadvantaged	Discretionary	Economically and/or educationally disadvantaged	Open
Number of hours	Minimum	Varies	Varies toward maximum	Maximum	Maximum
Nature of employers	Primarily public and non-profit	Primarily public and non-profit	Also private sector placements	Also private sector placements	Public and non-profit agencies
Additional Costs*	Eligibility certification	Eligibility certification	Targeted recruitment, job development, placement	Targeted recruitment, job development, cost of enrichment, additional administration	Targeted recruitment, job development, additional supervision & administration, materials & supplies

*Chart assumes cost of youth wages and basic administration, which includes standard recruitment, job development and placement throughout

During the 1970s and 1980s, the enunciation of a such a goal for summer programs disappeared, while intentions to develop employability received prominence. Nevertheless, many communities perceive the summer youth program primarily as a means to keep youth busy in the summer. In others -- to the degree that program development does not proceed with care and methods for enhancing employability are not included -- summer jobs programs remain, by default, occupiers of time for idle youth in the summer.

Number of youth served. Since the main goal of the program is to reduce idleness and provide activity for restless youth, such programs serve the largest possible number of youth, with secondary attention given to such matters as special needs, the nature of jobs and supervision.

Age of youth served. A program whose goal is the occupation of time is likely to be most effective in reducing the effects of idleness among younger youth. Older teenagers have higher expectations and more alternatives for activity. However, each community may examine its particular configuration of problems and decide to target, for example, 14-16 year olds who are in danger of dropping out of school and need additional incentives to remain; 14-16 year olds who have already dropped out but are unemployed and urgently need some connection with the work force; 16-18 year olds who show the most potential for disruptive behavior and the least potential for year-round employment, and so forth.

Other eligibility criteria. In order to serve as many youth as possible and to devote the highest percentage of resources to wages rather than to administration, the sole criterion here is economic eligibility. (During the 1960s, an additional criterion was the potential for disruptive behavior, but this factor has largely disappeared.

Hours. Again consistent with the program's goal, hours of work are minimal: as few as possible, consistent with the need to provide occupation for the largest number. Some programs add to the paid hours such additional time-users as travel to and from the job, filling out forms, and travel to collect the paycheck.

Employers. Since this type of program is generally publicly funded and devotes its resources mainly to wages, attention to specialized job development is minimal. Therefore, all the jobs tend to be in public and non-profit institutions, primarily those with a long history of participation in the summer youth jobs effort.

Additional costs. Costs beyond basic administration, youth wages and eligibility certification are minimal.

Goal II: Providing Income

A program whose primary goal is to provide income to economically disadvantaged youth may decide to identify the most needy youth and offer them maximum hours and income (Variant A), or may decide to spread the program more widely to a larger number of eligible youth who, therefore, will each earn less (Variant B).

Number. A choice of Variant B will result in enrollment of the maximum number of eligible youth. A choice of Variant A will result in service to smaller numbers.

Age. Such a program may be targeted to all or any age group in the range of eligible youth from 14 to 21.

Other criteria. This program characteristic depends upon the choice of goal: Variant A serves the most economically disadvantaged, Variant B serves the JTPA-eligible population more broadly. Physically or emotionally handicapped youth are also potential targets for such a summer program.

Hours. The number of hours will depend upon the choice of goal: Variant A will produce more hours and more income for a smaller number; Variant B, fewer hours and less income for a greater number.

Employers. Since, as with Goal I, resources are concentrated on providing wages, typical employers are public and non-profit institutions.

Additional costs. Costs beyond basic administration, youth wages and eligibility certification are minimal.

Goal III: Providing Structured Work Experience

Most programs that identify this goal -- structured work experience for youth who are taking their first dip into the labor market -- do little more than provide an opportunity to get their feet wet. Others view the goal in greater depth. They may develop opportunities for work experiences of increasing intensity over a series of summers and provide for close supervision, careful job development and even matching the interests and talents of individual youth with relevant jobs. The number and age of youth served, other eligibility criteria and hours of work will vary with the comprehensiveness of the program.

Number. Enrollment involves fewer youth than for Goals I and II, since additional funds are required for super-

vision and programing. Numbers will, of course, vary with the choice of goal. A more structured program will serve fewer youth more intensively.

Age. Programs that provide work experience appear to be more effective with the middle age group, 16 to 19 year olds. The younger group is not yet ready, and the older group should be moving on to the development of specific skills for their transition into the full-time labor market. Some programs hire older youth as supervisors.

Other criteria. Other criteria, too, will vary according to the choice of goal within the limits of work experience. A program may choose to enroll youth for their first exposure to the world of work, or may require a previous summer's enrollment in a work experience program.

Hours. This, too, will vary according to the choice of goal -- fewer hours (but more than for Goal I and Variant B of II) for basic work experience and more hours for an enriched component.

Employers. In addition to the public and non-profit sector employers appropriate for Goals I and II, work experience programs, particularly the more structured ones, may involve placements in the private sector.

Additional costs. Beyond basic administration and youth wages, additional funds are spent on recruitment of the youth who can benefit from the program design chosen, development of jobs appropriate to the goal, and placement of youth in jobs that match their experience and/or interest.

Goal IV: Improving Longer-Term Employability

Programs pursuing longer-term goals include enriched programs that often involve foundation or private-sector funding to supplement basic federal grants for summer youth employment programs. However, a several enrichments are allowable expenditures under the federal funding authorization, and communities may choose to provide enriched programs to fewer youth without seeking additional, non-federal funds.

Enriched programs vary widely, but the ultimate aim of all is to improve the long-term employability of economically and/or educationally disadvantaged youth. The emphasis may be on offering remediation and building up basic math and reading or functional competencies; it may be on providing structured work experience tailored to an individual youth's needs and interests; on career awareness, self-directed job search techniques, entrepreneurship skills, pre-employment training, mentoring or cultural enrichment. These goals can be pursued singly or in combination,

all tending toward the ultimate goal of keeping youth in school and/or increasing their competitiveness in the labor market.

The following review of program characteristics assumes that resources are limited, even if foundation and/or private sector funds are used to supplement federal support.

Number. Since planning and operating an enriched program requires substantial expenditures for development and administration, the number of youth served is substantially smaller than in programs with more limited goals.

Age. Age groups to be served will vary with the choice of program emphasis. Broadly, programs aiming to increase school retention will serve youth still in junior high or high school; programs aiming to provide career awareness, job search skills, pre-employment training and structured work experience will serve youth of high school age and out-of-school youth; mentoring and cultural enrichment are emphases appropriate for all ages.

Other criteria. These will also vary with the choice of program emphasis, but generally such programs serve youth who are economically and/or educationally disadvantaged.

Hours. Whatever the program emphasis, the number of hours is typically the maximum that available funding will allow.

Employers. Although many enrichments are provided in non-work settings, during hours other than those spent at work, many are integrated with work, and others depend upon the quality and supervision of the work experience. If the work itself is part of the enrichment, private-sector placements are generally sought in addition to those in the public and non-profit sectors.

Additional costs. Enriched programs are expensive, as summer youth jobs programs go. In addition to basic administration and youth wages, funding is necessary for recruitment, the costs of whatever enrichments are delivered, additional supervision and administration.

Goal V: Producing Improved Community Facilities or Services

Although benefits to the community flow from all summer youth employment programs, some establish as a primary goal the creation of permanent physical improvements -- in physical plant, natural resource use or parks -- or the delivery of social services needed in the community, such as day care for children or escort service for the elderly. Such programs tend to view

their goals as three-fold, emphasizing equally community benefits, youth employment and an orientation toward community service and collective responsibility.

Number. As with enriched employability development programs, the number of youth served is smaller than in programs with short-term goals.

Age. Since community improvement programs require a certain social maturity of their enrollees, 14 and 15 year olds are usually not included.

Other criteria. Most community improvement summer programs do not target disadvantaged youth, but are open to all who volunteer, regardless of their economic status or work history.

Hours. As with enriched programs, available work hours are at the maximum.

Employers. Public and non-profit agencies, particularly parks, forest districts, zoos and social service agencies.

Additional costs. Community improvement projects are among the more expensive of summer youth job programs. In addition to basic administration and youth wages, funding is necessary for recruitment, job development, materials and supplies. Additional supervision is necessary to ensure that productive work is done. Since federal JTPA funding can be used only to serve disadvantaged, JTPA-eligible youth, additional funds must be raised to cover program costs for enrollees who are not poor.

V. ISSUES AND OPTIONS FOR ALL PROGRAMS

In addition to the key characteristics that are a function of the choice of goals and objectives for a summer youth employment program, there are a group of issues and options to be considered by all programs. These issues include: placing summer programs in the context of a community's services; funding availability and decisions; offering unsubsidized or partially subsidized jobs as well as jobs that are wholly subsidized; setting priorities to meet the needs of youth, employers or the community; administration by an existing or newly-established organization; targeting or opening eligibility to all in the chosen age group; youth selection processes; and the degree of collaboration among entities in planning and operating a program.

Placing Summer Programs in Context

For most of its history, summer youth employment programing has been planned, developed and operated in isolation from other

youth employment services in the community. Now that resources are becoming ever more scarce, communities are recognizing that they must capitalize on these resources to produce the greatest possible fit. One way is to view summer programs as just one category of services in a community's array of services to youth.

In such a context, summer programs may be viewed as a neglected resource for delivering services to youth who are at risk of experiencing labor market problems as adults. These are the youth who are performing poorly in school; the dropouts; youth with special problems such as teenage parenthood, drug involvement or a criminal record; youth already in the labor market who experience long periods of joblessness and are not occupied with family and household responsibilities.

The lessons of the past 20 years have taught us that these problems are not intractable, that there is a finite number of skills that youth must master in order to compete successfully for jobs, and that some services and resources for addressing these needs already exist in most communities -- among them summer youth employment programs.

We also know that the four basic competencies youth need in order to develop the capacity for stable employment are most effectively conveyed by programs and strategies that are flexible enough to respond to the age and individual circumstances of the target youth. Of the four competencies -- basic educational skills, pre-employment skills, work maturity and occupational training -- it is clear that the first two, and possibly the third and fourth, can be pursued in a summer program planned as part of a continuum of youth services.

Set against these broad objectives, summer programs can produce greater benefits when they are planned to fill a gap along a continuum of youth services or to reinforce the efforts of a year-round program. On the basis of a community needs assessment, which includes the present availability of programs to fill identified needs, decisions can be made about the type of enriched summer program to be developed. Certainly, some youth will need only summer jobs and income. Others may need enriched programs that bridge gaps in their schooling, reinforce skills-training experiences of the school year, familiarize them with support services, and so on.

Funding

Although Service Delivery Areas have no option about the size of their Title IIB allocations for operating the federal Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP), they do have options about how to spend those funds within the constraints of federal requirements, funding uncertainties and political considerations.

Another option -- for untargeted programs, a necessity -- is to seek additional funding from foundations, the private sector and/or other federal, state or local sources. Additional support is also often available in kind. If the decision is made to seek supplementary funds and they are received, several options remain for the expenditure of those funds.

This additional funding can be used incrementally with Title IIB funds, stimulating and permitting SYEP to enrich summer programing with non-federal funding while reserving federal funds for basic administration and stipends. Additional funds could support such services as pre-employment or job search assistance, training in computers or other specialized fields where start-up and equipment costs are high, remedial education for younger participants or those most educationally disadvantaged, or the provision of adult mentors -- all allowable activities under JTPA, but a drain on funding for basic program services.

An alternate strategy would use the additional funds to establish separate programs that would cooperate with the SYEP program to segment the market for jobs and youth in a more deliberate and rational manner. For example, the private-sector program could provide higher-paying jobs or those with longer hours and more chance for permanent employment; could target older, more job-ready youth or reward those who have been successful in summer or year-round programs or schooling in the past. Foundation funding could support demonstrations of more creative utilization of summer programs. In this way, SYEP-funded programs would continue to serve those most in need of economic assistance and the additional segment could meet special needs and interests.

Subsidized vs. Unsubsidized Jobs

In a coordinated, city-wide approach to summer youth employment, a private-sector effort focused on generating unsubsidized jobs can complement the existing federally-funded program. If work-ready youth are a target population, unsubsidized jobs are also more likely to meet their needs for entrance to permanent employment. Moreover, providing unsubsidized jobs involves business directly in the summer jobs effort.

At the same time, unsubsidized jobs are more difficult to generate, and placements require more time and energy from the program staff. If a separate agency is administering this portion of the program, however, the SYEP staff is left free to serve those youth who are more difficult to place.

Our research shows that youth in unsubsidized jobs get more work hours and more money per person. Subsidized jobs, on the other hand, provide money and basic work experience to a larger number of youth, albeit in smaller amounts, because they are easier to generate. Thus, a basic choice exists -- between getting more pay and work experience into fewer hands, or fewer hours and less pay into more hands. An alternative would segment the summer

program into components that serve different populations and needs.

Setting priorities among the needs of youth/business/community

The business community is interested in programs that can provide a hiring pool and respond quickly and efficiently to their need for employees. Potential employers may also seek youth in a certain age group or at a certain level of development.

Youth needs may dictate different priorities. Most youth enter the summer job market in search of additional income and work experience, but with few or none of the skills employers take for granted in hiring. Therefore, youth who most need help finding jobs are also those least job ready and least appealing to employers.

A community's needs for conservation efforts or delivery of services dictate yet other priorities. For such programs, recruitment of youth who are broadly representative of the community and have a motivation to work may be desirable.

Striking a balance between these potentially conflicting demands is necessary, since many details of program administration will flow from the basic decision about whose needs will receive priority.

Administration

Incorporating the summer youth employment program into an existing organization with prior experience in administering programs of this kind capitalizes on the expertise, experience and track record with potential employers. Such a choice, however, requires that the new effort be made a clear priority for an organization that already discharges many other responsibilities.

Creating a new agency to run part or all of a summer program, on the other hand, has the potential advantage of being focused from the outset on a single priority. But its success requires clear attention from the beginning to the leadership, training and team-building necessary to any organization.

Creating an agency to operate some part of the program -- say the private-sector, unsubsidized portion -- requires joint approaches. The experience of cities with such joint operations suggests that public agencies can make substantial contributions to private sector jobs programs. In such efforts, the strengths of both public and private institutions must be clearly assessed and appropriately used.

A second vital administrative issue concerns year-round or seasonal operation. The experience of most programs has been that, while year-round administration requires constant funding from resources that are becoming scarce, planning and developmental

tasks cannot otherwise be accomplished in a timely fashion and, ultimately

A third administrative issue involves the degree to which planning, development and operation of a summer program is a collaborative effort among a variety of organizations. Certainly, collaboration is much more complex an approach to administration, but it makes possible the contribution of a wider spectrum of contacts, expertise, funding bases and program opportunities.

Summer youth program collaborations have included such configurations as: the administrative entity of the SDA, one private-sector agency handling subsidized jobs and another handling unsubsidized placements in the private sector; seven universities, the school district and the public employment and training agency; a foundation and two school districts; a university, a nonprofit agency, the Job Service and a foundation. The possibilities are endless.

Targeting

Choice of a target group for participants is based on criteria that include goals, age, work-readiness, selected deficiencies that a program seeks to remedy or potentials a program seeks to advance, and income eligibility. Choosing any set of criteria to define the target group will have implications for program design.

Targeting older youth, for example, may mean that job development must focus on unsubsidized jobs that have the potential to become permanent employment. If the project targets older youth, it must be designed to market them to employers as potential, long-term, hires.

Yet, employers may often prefer youth under 18 in summer programs because this younger group earns them higher tax credits through the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit program, if it is reauthorized beyond 1985, though younger youth are more readily served by subsidized jobs because their immediate needs are for short-term work experience and pay, not permanent employment.

As for income eligibility, targeting the most disadvantaged youth focuses programs on the needs of a group with few alternatives. Untargeted programs open to a cross-section of volunteers offer the benefits of building intergroup respect and teamwork. Experience to date has been that community benefit programs, emphasizing the quality of work and service tend to be untargeted, as do several enriched programs. Those whose goals are specifically to provide income and work experience to youth without contacts or access to other types of jobs serve only the disadvantaged. One other alternative is to open enrollment to a range of eligibles and establish recruitment goals for, for example, females, minority-group members and/or the economically disadvantaged.

Other targeting decisions, many of which are implied by the se-

lection of goals for an enriched program, will focus on the educationally disadvantaged, youth who have done well in school or in summer programs in previous summers, youth with a special interest in conservation or community service, youth at risk of dropping out of school, youth with special interests or who occupy a specified place on the roster of educational attainment.

Youth Selection Processes

Summer programs have used a variety of methods -- first come, first served; lottery; lottery plus interview; point systems; application and interview with employers for specific jobs; selection by community-based organizations according to announced criteria.

Our review of sites that use different selection criteria indicates that competitive methods which involve application, screening and interviews allow youth to match personal interests to jobs and provide exposure to real hiring practices. However, competitive hiring often screens against those most in need and makes it difficult, if not impossible, to control creaming and/or favoritism in hiring.

VI. SUMMARY

Conclusions

1. As currently operated in most communities, the work experience component of summer youth jobs programs has little if any impact on a youth's long-term employability. These programs are, however, meeting a variety of short-term objectives.

2. The management of summer jobs programs is typically difficult. The brevity and intensity of the summer effort makes it difficult to maintain an infrastructure or to develop a network of contacts; therefore, the federally-funded Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (SYEP) tends to be isolated from other youth employment efforts.

3. Management difficulties contribute to the underutilization of SYEP as a major resource in the effort to provide economically and educationally disadvantaged youth with services that can prevent their long-term unemployment as adults.

4. Because of the foregoing, capitalization on this resource requires a special focus and special measures designed to exploit the potential of summer youth employment programs.

Recommendations

1. Set clear goals. If short-term goals are chosen, it is important to be clear about them and to set in place mechanisms that will achieve them most effectively. Consideration should be given, however, to pursuing longer-term goals in at least some components of the summer program.

2. Set goals within the context of the community's youth employment efforts. After identifying the priority goals of a community's overall youth employability development effort, components may be selected that can best be supported by summer programs. For large sites, this would require employment of year-round summer program staff.

3. Introduce enriched summer program components. Enrichments are the most promising approach to using SYEP more effectively. Most communities are large enough to consider at least one enriched segment; some can afford to establish two or more. The choice of enrichments should flow from the linkages established as part of the effort discussed in recommendations. (Examples: if younger in-school youth are identified as a priority target, remediation enrichment may be appropriate; for older youth, a self-directed job search experience or a component designed to familiarize them with job-finding resources in the community may be called for. All enriched programs would build on the incentive value of a summer job while maintaining the income transfer objectives of the SYEP.)

4. Identify private sector resources among businesses and foundations. The private sector should be viewed as a major resource for the support of summer jobs programs. Since community businesses inevitably become involved in summer job activity, the potential exists to channel that activity to serve broader public aims. The private sector can not only provide funds and job placements, but can establish jobs to be filled as a reward for progressing successfully through public agency jobs, and as an incentive to think about the future.

5. Establish coordinating mechanisms. Public agencies -- primarily the state Job Service and the local agency responsible for administering JTPA -- and the private sector -- businesses and foundations -- all have different agendas and clienteles. All have a vital role to play in the development of effective summer jobs programing. But those roles must be orchestrated if all these interests are to work

together to serve all segments of the community identified as priority targets through the process suggested in recommendation 2.

6. Focus on management and quality. Irrespective of the choice of goal, the effectiveness of any program depends on the mundane issue of how carefully the goal is pursued. Crucial management issues include advance work on developing appropriate jobs, monitoring the quality of worksites, securing high quality supervision and ensuring that good work gets done. These are the program components that are central to reinforcing the basic mission of summer youth jobs: inculcation of the conviction that work has value.